

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MICHAEL PIERCE v. CHRISTOPHER CROSS, et al.,

7:05-CV-1477 (TJM/GJD)

MICHAEL PIERCE, Plaintiff pro se
NELSON SHEINGOLD, Asst. Attorney General for defendant Cross
PAUL V. MULLIN, ESQ. for Lewis County Defendants

ORDER

On February 15, 2007, this court received a document from plaintiff that was filed as a “Motion for Discovery.” (Dkt. No. 42). Upon closer review of this document, it appears that there are actually two documents contained in the submission by plaintiff. The first document is entitled “Jurisdiction Motion,” and the second motion is the “Discovery.” Because these two documents appear to have been filed as one document, the court will order that the documents be filed separately and that the docket sheet be corrected to reflect the filing of two separate documents.

WHEREFORE, it is

ORDERED, that the Clerk of the Court shall separate the two documents that have been filed as Dkt. No. 42, and it is further

ORDERED, that the document entitled “Discovery” be filed as Dkt. No. 42, retaining the label of “Discovery Motion,” and it is further

ORDERED, that the document entitled “Jurisdiction Motion” shall be filed as Dkt. No. 43 and docketed as a “Jurisdiction Motion.”

Dated: March 5, 2007



Hon. Gustave J. DiBianco
U.S. Magistrate Judge